

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Non-Final Office Action dated April 29, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

The Examiner objects to Fig. 4 of the drawings for not showing the first pad of claims 1 and 7. Applicant submits that the Examiner's objection that Fig. 4 fails to show "how the first pad...is formed on top of the light guide such that it thermally shuts off the liquid crystal panel and the optical sheets from a light in the backlight assembly" is moot in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 7 discussed below. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to Fig. 4.

Claims 1-11 are currently pending. In the Office Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant amends claims 1 and 7 to more broadly recite the features of Applicant's invention, and respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7 as amended overcome the Examiner rejection under § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants add new claims 12-18 to provide an alternate scope of coverage of Applicant's invention in the claims.

Claims 1-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art (Fig. 2, hereinafter "Applicant's Related Art") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,146,354 to Plesinger (hereinafter "Plesinger"). Claims 6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art in view of Plesinger as applied to claims 1-5 and 7 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,141 B1 to Kawano et al. (hereinafter "Kawano"). Applicant hereby traverses these rejections for the reasons set forth below.

The rejection of claims 1-6 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a pad provided between the panel guide and the backlight assembly and away from the light source forming a distance between the panel guide and the backlight assembly and thermally separating the liquid crystal panel and the optical sheets from the light source.” None of the cited references including Applicant’s Related Art, Plesinger, and Kawano, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The structure of claim 1 of the present application is different from the Plesinger structure in that Plesinger does not teach or suggest a pad provided between the panel guide and the backlight assembly. In Plesinger, the heat insulation layer 146, alleged by the Examiner to disclose the pad of the claim, is “between the back frame member 120 of the metal frame 118, and the heat fin member 144 of the heat conductive shield 142” (Plesinger, column 5, lines 5-8). Furthermore, Fig. 3 of Plesinger clearly shows that the layer 146 is directly above the lamp 100. Therefore, layer 146 is not “between the panel guide and the backlight assembly and away from the light source” as required by claim 1. In addition, the structure of claim 1 of the present application is different from Kawano in that Kawano does not teach or suggest a pad provided in relation to the panel guide or the backlight assembly at all. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 7-11 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 7-11 is allowable over the cited references in that independent claim 7 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a first pad provided between the panel guide and the light guide”. None of the cited references including Applicant’s Related

Art, Plesinger, and Kawano, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The structure of claim 7 of the present application is different from the Plesinger and Kawano structures in that they do not teach or suggest a first pad provided between the panel guide and the light guide. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is allowable over the cited references. Applicant submit that claims 8-11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 7.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.


If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: October 29, 2003

Respectfully submitted,


By Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant